

EIA on Pilot for Houses of Multiple Occupation for Leaving Care and Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children

<i>Did you use the EIA Screening Tool?</i> (Delete as applicable)	Yes
--	-----

1. Explaining the matter being assessed

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer
<p><i>What policy, function or service change are you assessing?</i></p>	<p>This project seeks to enable Surrey care leavers and Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children (UASC) to access Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) as a new pathway to independent living, which is currently not available in SCC commissioned services in the county.</p> <p>The provision will seek to empower Surrey young people to gain the necessary skills which will enable them to live independently, achieve their aspirations and remain in the county. By finding the right provision for the right young people we will also improve value for money.</p> <p>This project will look to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create up to 24 bed spaces for Leaving Care young people age 18-25 in houses of multiple occupation in the county, with implementation of the first 4-bed property starting from around April 2023: and • Develop a longer-term strategy for HMOs in Surrey <p>The project will be looking to co-design the provision with care experienced young people.</p> <p>This project supports four key priorities set out in the Surrey County Council's Corporate Parenting Sufficiency Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surrey homes for Surrey children • A wide range of placements for diverse needs • Homes of the highest quality • Support to move to independence <p>This project is being delivered as part of the Placement Value and Outcomes (PVO) Transformation Programme.</p> <p>There are currently no beds in SCC HMOs of this type within the county. This model of delivery fits within the best practice Care Leaver Accommodation and Support Framework, developed by St Basil's and Barnardos.</p>

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer
<p><i>Why does this EIA need to be completed?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The buildings that are to be used for the project might not have disability access which will affect young people that have physical disabilities. Possible concerns are: Access to buildings, stairs to rooms, bathrooms and toilets not adapted for disabled use • The EIA is aimed at a specific age group, 18-25 and looks at the possible impact this age group might have on service provision • The EIA looks at the ethnic profile of the target group and the possible impact this might have on service provision
<p><i>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</i></p>	<p>Leaving Care or UASC young people with No Recourse to Public Funds, aged 18-25</p>
<p><i>How does your service proposal support the outcomes in the Community Vision for Surrey 2030?</i></p>	<p>This proposal is linked to the following Vision Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children and young people are safe and feel safe and confident • Everyone has healthy, active, and fulfilling lives and makes good choices about their wellbeing • Everyone gets the health and social care support and information they need at the right time and place • Communities are welcoming and supportive, especially of those most in need and people feel able to contribute to the community life • Everyone has a place called home with appropriate housing for all • Residents live in clean, safe, and green communities where people and communities embrace their environmental responsibilities

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer
<p><i>Are there any specific geographies in Surrey where this will make an impact?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Epsom and Ewell • Guildford • Woking • Redhill/Reigate • Spelthorne • Runnymede <p>It is noted that these are the areas we initially intend to explore development of provision. Over time other areas of the county may be explored due to changes in patterns of need and/or availability of suitable accommodation and/or support from the local brough or district council.</p>
<p><i>Briefly list what evidence you have gathered on the impact of your proposals</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research into availability of suitable buildings in desired areas carried out by Land and Property Team • Data, including mapping, of care leavers in supported accommodation placements and older looked after children in Surrey • Feedback from care leavers and UASC currently accessing supported accommodation in Surrey, including information from the User Voice and Participation Team and Appreciative Inquiry interviews with young people • Feedback from professionals and providers currently delivering supported accommodation for care leavers in Surrey • Best practice models, including the Care Leaver Accommodation and Support Framework, developed by St Basil's and Barnardos.

2. Service Users / Residents

There are 10 protected characteristics to consider in your proposal. These are:

1. Age including younger and older people
2. Disability
3. Gender reassignment
4. Pregnancy and maternity
5. Race including ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality
6. Religion or belief including lack of belief
7. Sex
8. Sexual orientation
9. Marriage/civil partnerships
10. Carers protected by association

Though not included in the Equality Act 2010, Surrey County Council recognises that socio-economic disadvantage is a significant contributor to inequality across the County and therefore regards this as an additional factor.

Therefore, if relevant, you will need to include information on this. Please **refer to the EIA guidance** if you are unclear as to what this is.

Equality Impact Assessment

Disability

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	<p>Details on the service users/residents that could be affected. Try and be as specific as possible.</p> <p>This proposal is targeting Leaving Care and USAC young people age 18-21. As at 17 November 2022 there were 848 care leavers (aged 16-25) open to Surrey County Council. Of these, 64 or 7.55% were on the Disability Register. None of these 64 young people were also formally Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children.</p>
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	Negative / Positive

<i>Impacts identified</i>	<i>Supporting evidence</i>	<i>How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?</i>	<i>When will this be implemented by?</i>	<i>Owner</i>
Negative - Potential for new properties to not be accessible to young people with disabilities, including facilities and rooms.	7.55% of care leavers are identified as having disabilities	Ensure that accessibility of the property is considered as a core requirement, in line with the needs of target groups for the accommodation	January 2023 onwards	Project lead
Positive – enabling young people who are more independent to access lower-support accommodation should increase access to local accommodation for those with higher support needs	7.55% of care leavers are identified as having disabilities	Once new HMOs are established, we will enable more young people to move out of higher support accommodation	April 2023 onwards	Project lead

Equality Impact Assessment

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of?	The council intends for this accommodation to be accessed by care leavers who are close to independence and have relatively low-level support needs. This accommodation is intended for young people who are close to being able to live independently, providing a steppingstone for them from supported accommodation into their own tenancies. Care leavers with higher levels of need would access higher support provision and/or be eligible for provision through Adult Social Care.

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	There are no known negative impacts that cannot be mitigated as things stand, relating to disability

Race

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	<p>This proposal is targeting Leaving Care and UASC young people aged 18-21</p> <p>The ethnic breakdown of the care leaving population as at 17 November 2022 was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • White – 424 / 50.0% • Black – 169 / 19.9% • Asian – 111 / 13.1% • Mixed background – 56 / 6.6% • Any other ethnic group – 54 / 6.4% • Information not yet obtained – 33 / 3.89% • Gypsy / Roma – less than 1% <p>(data obtained from Analysis and Evaluation team)</p> <p>Below is the date for the ethnic breakdown for Surrey overall:</p>

Equality Impact Assessment

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • White British 84.0% • African 0.7% • Any other Asian 1.7% • Any other ethnic group 0.5% • Any other mixed background 0.6% • Any other white background 6.0% • White and black Caribbean 0.4% • Any other Black background 0.1% • White and Black African 0.2% <p>Source: Census-Office of National Statistics</p> <p>This data shows that there is significantly higher representation from Black, Asian, Mixed background and other ethnic groups in Surrey’s Care Leaving population than the overall population.</p> <p>As at 17 November 2022, 315 of 848 care leavers aged 16-25 were formerly unaccompanied asylum-seeking children (37.15%).</p>
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	Both

<i>Impacts identified</i>	<i>Supporting evidence</i>	<i>How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?</i>	<i>When will this be implemented by?</i>	<i>Owner</i>
Negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Racism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equality Act 2010 • The Race Relation Act (Amendment) 2000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure providers commissioned to provide floating support have 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All actions to be in place by April 2023, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioned provider /

Equality Impact Assessment

<i>Impacts identified</i>	<i>Supporting evidence</i>	<i>How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?</i>	<i>When will this be implemented by?</i>	<i>Owner</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to understand other people’s culture • Not respecting each other • Not understanding other people’s religion • Not understanding other’s language and YP speaking in their language in the midst of others who do not understand what is being said • Sex/Gender conflict-not understanding sexuality concepts <p>Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting to understand other’s culture • Appreciating other people not from one’s culture • Learning to get along with other people • Accepting differences 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear EDI policies and procedures and that these are followed at HMOs • EDI posters put up in the services to make service users aware of diversity issues • EDI discussed in house meetings • Personal Advisors and Key Workers to discuss EDI issues with the young people they support, as a part of core practice • Ensure there is translation support at key points in a young person’s journey • Ensure young people are appropriately matched alongside others living in the HMO and that transitions in are well managed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • before the first HMO opens • Ongoing review and monitoring as part of contract management and staff supervisions 	<p>Contract manager</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Care Leaving Service • Gateway to Resources

Equality Impact Assessment

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
<p>What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equality and fair access policies in place • Customer service framework in place • Existing commissioning arrangements for floating support provision ensure providers will comply with EDI requirements when supporting young people • Surrey County Council is anticipating an increase in the number of UASC young people coming to Surrey following changes to the National Transfer scheme, which has increased the “cap” local authorities are intended to meet in terms of the proportion of UASC from 0.07% to 0.1%. Based on current levels, this would equate to around 140 additional young people living in Surrey. Development of these move on HMOs also supports SCC’s response to this new pressure.

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
<p>Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All negative aspects can be mitigated if the above are followed

Equality Impact Assessment

Age

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>																						
<p>What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?</p>	<p>This proposal is targeting Leaving Care and UASC young people age 18-25, although it is anticipated that the majority of residents will be aged 18-21.</p> <p>The below table shows the age distribution of the current care leaver population, with clear majority aged 18-21. It is important to note that this accommodation will only be available to care leaver aged 18+.</p> <table> <thead> <tr> <th>Age</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>25</td><td>0.5%</td></tr> <tr><td>24</td><td>3.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>23</td><td>4.9%</td></tr> <tr><td>22</td><td>8.4%</td></tr> <tr><td>21</td><td>12.7%</td></tr> <tr><td>20</td><td>23.3%</td></tr> <tr><td>19</td><td>20.4%</td></tr> <tr><td>18</td><td>25.4%</td></tr> <tr><td>17</td><td>1.1%</td></tr> <tr><td>16</td><td>0.2%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Age	%	25	0.5%	24	3.0%	23	4.9%	22	8.4%	21	12.7%	20	23.3%	19	20.4%	18	25.4%	17	1.1%	16	0.2%
Age	%																						
25	0.5%																						
24	3.0%																						
23	4.9%																						
22	8.4%																						
21	12.7%																						
20	23.3%																						
19	20.4%																						
18	25.4%																						
17	1.1%																						
16	0.2%																						
<p>Impacts (Delete as applicable)</p>	<p>Both</p>																						

<i>Impacts identified</i>	<i>Supporting evidence</i>	<i>How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?</i>	<i>When will this be implemented by?</i>	<i>Owner</i>
<p>Positives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision is being restricted to ages 18-25 to 	<p>There are low numbers of care leavers aged 16 and</p>	<p>The pilot will specifically target: Leaving Care and</p>	<p>April 2023 onwards</p>	<p>Project sponsors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Care Leaving Service

Equality Impact Assessment

<i>Impacts identified</i>	<i>Supporting evidence</i>	<i>How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?</i>	<i>When will this be implemented by?</i>	<i>Owner</i>
<p>enable them to gain independent living skills to move on successfully</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security of being amongst peers • Potential for developing positive relationships <p>Negatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to cause neighbourhood tensions because of antisocial behaviour and/or negative perceptions of young people in some local communities • Potential of poor supervision/guidance of YP which could lead to antisocial behaviour 	<p>17 and other housing options that provide a more appropriate level of support are available in Surrey. It is not legal to place children under the age of 16 in accommodation that is not registered with Ofsted.</p> <p>Insights and experience of supporting care leavers in this kind of setting via the Care Leaving Service.</p> <p>Engagement with partner providers who already run supported accommodation in Surrey.</p>	<p>UASC YP age 18-25 to gain independent living skills; who have demonstrated that they require a low level of support, in line with the proposed model of up to 3-hours key work support per week.</p> <p>Proactive approach taken to community engagement when HMO properties are purchased, to support positive relationships with local community.</p> <p>High-quality floating support to be commissioned to provide support for young people in HMOs, along with drop-in space for SCC staff supporting young people, so that any potential for antisocial behaviour and/or issues with neighbours can be address</p>	<p>January 2023 onwards (as properties are identified and secured)</p> <p>April 2023 onwards</p>	<p>Commissioning Team</p> <p>Contract manager / Provider / Care Leaving Service</p>

Equality Impact Assessment

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of?	There are no known changes that the council is planning that may affect this group of residents

Question	Answer
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	There are no negative impacts that cannot be mitigated.

Sex/Gender

Question	Answer												
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	The accommodation is intended to be mixed sex. There are more care leavers who are male than female, as shown in the table below: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>%</th> <th>Number</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>63.8%</td> <td>541</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>36.0%</td> <td>305</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not known</td> <td>0.2%</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	%	Number	Male	63.8%	541	Female	36.0%	305	Not known	0.2%	2
Sex	%	Number											
Male	63.8%	541											
Female	36.0%	305											
Not known	0.2%	2											
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	Both												

Equality Impact Assessment

<i>Impacts identified</i>	<i>Supporting evidence</i>	<i>How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?</i>	<i>When will this be implemented by?</i>	<i>Owner</i>
<p>Positives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased appropriate accommodation options in Surrey for Care Leaver, including former UASC <p>Negatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for young people whose specific needs or circumstances mean they would not be able to live in a mixed sex house to be unable to access the provision. 	<p>On occasion SCC needs to source accommodation that is single sex to meet the specific needs of young people.</p>	<p>Ensure suitable accommodation options are available in the county to meet the needs of young people who require single-sex accommodation.</p> <p>Ensure appropriate matching is undertaken ahead of young people being referred to an HMO accommodation.</p>	<p>August 2021 onwards</p> <p>January 2023 onwards (as properties are identified and secured)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commissioning Team Gateway to Resources and Care Leaving Service

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
<p>What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents?</p> <p>Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of?</p>	<p>There are no known changes that the council is planning that may affect this group of residents</p>

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
<p>Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why</p>	<p>There are no negative impacts that cannot be mitigated.</p>

Equality Impact Assessment

Religion or belief including lack of belief

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	<p>Whilst specific data is not available for Surrey relating to religious beliefs (including lack of belief) amongst care leavers in Surrey in general, there is no reason to suggest that the profile is this is different to Surrey's population as a whole. It is going to be important to ensure that the religious beliefs of care leavers are taken into account when they are referred to HMO accommodation in Surrey, for example whether or not there are appropriate worshipping communities they should access if they so wish.</p> <p>In particular, there is anecdotal evidence that suggests religion plays an important role in the lives of many unaccompanied asylum-seeking children and young people (for example: Religion in the Lives of Unaccompanied Minors: An Available and Compelling Coping Resource, British Journal of Social Work, Muirean, 2010). In particular a young person's faith or belief can be an important source of continuity in their lives as they move into a largely unfamiliar context. With this in mind, and the potential for formerly UASC care leavers to be placed in HMOs, it would be appropriate to consider the proximity to a range of faith groups as part of our planning.</p>
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	Both

Equality Impact Assessment

<i>Impacts identified</i>	<i>Supporting evidence</i>	<i>How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?</i>	<i>When will this be implemented by?</i>	<i>Owner</i>
<p>Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential lack of access to appropriate places of worship or communities for former UASC, at a time where faith may provide a source of continuity • Not understanding faith and beliefs of others leading to difficult relationships <p>Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting to understand other's culture • Appreciating other people not from one's culture • Learning to get along with other people • Accepting differences 	<p>Religion in the Lives of Unaccompanied Minors: An Available and Compelling Coping Resource, British Journal of Social Work, Muirean, 2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure consideration is given to access to appropriate faith communities when locations of HMOs are decided upon. • Ensure young peoples' faith and/or belief is considered as part of matching young people into HMOs. • EDI posters put up in the services to make service users aware of diversity issues • EDI discussed in house meetings • Personal Advisors and Key Workers to discuss EDI issues with the young people they support, as a part of core practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All actions to be in place by April 2023, before the first HMO opens • Ongoing review and monitoring as part of contract management and staff supervisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioned provider / Contract manager • Care Leaving Service • Gateway to Resources

Equality Impact Assessment

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
<p>What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equality and fair access policies in place • Customer service framework in place • Existing commissioning arrangements for floating support provision ensure providers will comply with EDI requirements when supporting young people • Surrey County Council is anticipating an increase in the number of UASC young people coming to Surrey following changes to the National Transfer scheme, which has increased the “cap” local authorities are intended to meet in terms of the proportion of UASC from 0.07% to 0.1%. Based on current levels, this would equate to around 140 additional young people living in Surrey. Development of these move on HMOs also supports SCC’s response to this new pressure.

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
<p>Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All negative aspects can be mitigated if the above are followed

Equality Impact Assessment

3. Staff

All staff

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer N/A</i>
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	No specific considerations linked to age and staff associated with this proposal, although the creation of this new accommodation will create an additional accommodation pathway in Surrey for care leavers, which will benefit staff in the Care Leaving Service, as well as providing an additional drop-in location for workers to engage with young people.
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	Positive

<i>Impacts identified</i>	<i>Supporting evidence</i>	<i>How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?</i>	<i>When will this be implemented by?</i>	<i>Owner</i>
Positive - New accommodation pathway, supporting Care Leaving Staff to enable young people to access local accommodation	This proposal is intended to create 24 beds in locations across Surrey for care leavers	Ensure that the implementation of this new model is well communicated to care leaving service and that they are involved in development of proposals	From August 2021 onwards	Commissioning Team

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of?	N/A

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	There are no negative impacts that cannot be mitigated.

Equality Impact Assessment

Disability

Question	Answer N/A
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	Staff within the Care Leaving Service, Gateway to Resources Service and/or Commissioning Team with disabilities might be prevented from accessing certain types of accommodation due to the facilities not meeting their individual needs.
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	Negative / Positive

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
Positive - New accommodation pathway, supporting Care Leaving Staff to enable young people to access local accommodation	This proposal is intended to create 24 beds in locations across Surrey for care leavers. This will reduce the need for travelling further associated with placements made outside of Surrey	Ensure that the implementation of this new model is well communicated to care leaving service and that they are involved in development of proposals	From August 2021 onwards	Commissioning Team
Negative - Potential for new properties to not be accessible to staff with disabilities, including facilities and rooms.		Ensure that accessibility of the property is considered as a core requirement, in line with the needs of target groups for the accommodation	January 2023 onwards	Project lead

Equality Impact Assessment

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of	N/A

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	There are no negative impacts that cannot be mitigated.

You will need to copy and paste these boxes for each of the protected characteristics likely to be impacted

4. Amendments to the proposals

<i>CHANGE</i>	<i>REASON FOR CHANGE</i>
Ensure that accessibility is considered at all HMO properties purchased by SCC	This is to enable young people with disabilities to access this accommodation, where this is appropriate to their needs.
Ensure provider/s commissioned to deliver floating support have appropriate policies, procedures and practice to ensure EDI considerations are addressed with young people.	This will support all young people accessing the accommodation to be treated with fairness and respect, and learn about engaging positively with difference.

5. Recommendation

Based your assessment, please indicate which course of action you are recommending to decision makers. You should explain your recommendation below.

<i>Outcome Number</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Tick</i>
Outcome One	No major change to the policy/service/function required. This EIA has not identified any potential for discrimination or negative impact, and all opportunities to promote equality have been undertaken	X
Outcome Two	Adjust the policy/service/function to remove barriers identified by the EIA or better advance equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers you identified?	
Outcome Three	Continue the policy/service/function despite potential for negative impact or missed opportunities to advance equality identified. You will need to make sure the EIA clearly sets out the justifications for continuing with it. You need to consider whether there are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient plans to stop or minimise the negative impact • Mitigating actions for any remaining negative impacts plans to monitor the actual impact. 	
Outcome Four	Stop and rethink the policy when the EIA shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination (For guidance on what is unlawful discrimination, refer to the Equality and Human Rights Commission's guidance and Codes of Practice on the Equality Act concerning employment, goods and services and equal pay).	



Equality Impact Assessment

<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Confirmation and explanation of recommended outcome	This is fundamentally about creating a new accommodation pathway in Surrey that better meets the needs of care leavers (including former UASC) who are ready to progress to independence. Provided the mitigations are in place in terms of appropriate policies, procedures and practice, there are not any negative impacts associated with this proposal that cannot be mitigated.

6a. Version control

<i>Version Number</i>	<i>Purpose/Change</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Date</i>
Version 1.0	Original draft	Adolphus Marshal	25 August 2021
Version 1.1	Updated for 2023/24 Budget	Chris Tisdall	18 November 2022

The above provides historical data about each update made to the Equality Impact Assessment. Please do include the name of the author, date and notes about changes made – so that you are able to refer back to what changes have been made throughout this iterative process. For further information, please see the EIA Guidance document on version control.

6b. Approval

<i>Approved by*</i>	<i>Date approved</i>
Head of Service	18/11/2022
Executive Director	06/01/2023
Cabinet Member	16/01/2023
Directorate Equality Group	23 November 2022

EIA Author	Adolphus Marshall
-------------------	-------------------

*Secure approval from the appropriate level of management based on nature of issue and scale of change being assessed.

6c. EIA Team

<i>Name</i>	<i>Job Title</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>Team Role</i>
Adolphus Marshall	Commissioning Officer	Surrey County Council	Lead author

Equality Impact Assessment

<i>Name</i>	<i>Job Title</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>Team Role</i>
David Neill-Hall	Senior Commissioning Officer	Surrey County Council	Data Analyst
Chris Tisdall	Head of Commissioning – Corporate Parenting	Surrey County Council	Editorial support

If you would like this information in large print, Braille, on CD or in another language please contact us on:

Tel: 03456 009 009

Textphone (via Text Relay): 18001 03456 009 009

SMS: 07860 053 465

Email: contactcentre@surreycc.gov.uk